

2

A SUPPLEMENT TO THE LAST
EDITION OF THE LORDS'
PROTESTS:

CONTAINING,
The PROTESTS from June 1767, to May
1770.

Printed in the Year MDCCLXX.

[Price One Shilling.]

A STATEMENT TO THE
LORDS OF THE LORDS
PROTESTS

CONTAINING
THE HISTORY OF THE
MAY

Printed in the Year 1704
[Name of the Printer]

C O N T E N T S

OF THE

S U P P L E M E N T.

	page
P ROTEST against Passing the Bill for Regulating the Proceedings of the East-India Com- pany —————	5
— Against admitting the Son of Lady Jane Dou- glas —————	32
— Against adjourning a Motion upon the State of the Nation —————	11
— On the Subject of the Middlesex Election	15
— A Second Protest on the Same ———	24
Lord Chatham's Bill to reverse the Proceedings of the House of Commons on the Middlesex Election —————	34
Protest against rejecting the said Bill ———	39

This Day are Published.

1. **A** Collection of the Lords Protefts, from the first upon Record, in the reign of Henry III. to June 1767. To which is annexed the scarce and valuable tract of St. Amand, on the legislative power of England : wherein the origin of both Houses of Parliament, their antient constitution, and the changes that happened in the persons that composed them, with the occasion thereof, are related in chronological order ; and many things concerning the English government ; the antiquity of the laws of England, and the feudal law, are occasionally illustrated and explained. In 2 vols. 8vo. Price 12s. bound.
2. A collection of the Lords Protefts of Ireland, from the first upon Record, to the present time.
3. The History, Debates and Proceedings of the British House of Commons, from 1742, to the dissolution of the Parliament in 1761. Containing the most remarkable Motions, Speeches, Orders, and Resolutions, during that period. By the editors of the former parliamentary histories and debates ; to which this Work is a complete and regular continuation. In 5 vol. 8vo. Price 1l. 5s. in boards, and 1l. 10s. bound.
4. Debates in the House of Commons of Ireland, during the years 1763 and 1764. By Sir James Caldwell, Bart. To which is added, an Enquiry how far the restrictions laid upon the trade of Ireland, by British acts of Parliament, are a benefit to the British dominions in general, and to the English in particular, for whose separate advantage they were intended. Dedicated, by permission, to the Earl of Chatham. In 2 vols. 8vo. Pr. 12s. bound.
As Ireland is become of late years much more an object of public attention than formerly, the parliamentary debates in that kingdom must become proportionably more interesting and important. In the debates of the above period, are many particulars which distinguish them from those of all preceding years ; and many questions are discussed, which must be the subject of debate in all times to come.
5. Speech of a Rt. Hon. Gentleman, on the motion for expelling Mr. Wilkes, Feb. 3, 1769, 1s.
6. Speech against the suspending and dispensing prerogative, 1s. 6d.

THE
LORDS PROTESTS,
FROM

Feb. 8, 1768, to May 1, 1770.

Die Lunæ, 8^o Februarii, 1768.

HODIE 3^o *vice lecta est billa*, entitled,
An Act for further regulating the
Proceedings of the United Company of
Merchants of England trading to the
East Indies, with respect to the making
of Dividends.

The question was put, Whether the said
bill shall pass?

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Dissentient',

1st, Because this bill is an exertion of
the supreme power of Parliament, equally
unnecessary and dangerous, after having
B had

6 P R O T E S T S. A. 1768.

had the most mortifying experience of the operation of a like restriction last year, which encreased the very mischief it was intended to remedy, at a time when the circumstances of the company are clear beyond a doubt, and their opulence verified beyond the most sanguine expectation: no supposed misconduct of the company calling for the interposition of parliament; no rash and excessive dividends declared; no encrease of dividends even desired: on the contrary, the company have restrained itself on principles much more rational than those adopted by the bill, as they have a reference to their circumstances, and not to a fixed period of time, marked by an arbitrary resolution. We cannot therefore avoid considering this bill as a mere act of power, without a colour of delinquency on the part of the company, or of necessity on the part of the public.

2dly, Because it appears to us, that this bill is an high violation of the national faith, taking away, without any judicial process, or even any criminal charge, that
power

power of declaring dividends, which the company purchased from the public for a valuable consideration.

3dly, Because it appears to us altogether unaccountable, to pass in one year an act for regulating the modes and conditions of declaring dividends by the company; and, in the very next year, to prohibit the exercise of those very powers so regulated: this act is now in full force; no defect in it has been stated; no amendment has been proposed; no infraction has been pretended. This law, made expressly to regulate the method of declaring dividends, does of necessity imply the exercise of that right under the conditions therein prescribed, which cannot be taken from the E. I. Company, without the most signal disgrace to the wisdom and good faith of the legislature, and the subversion of every principle of legal government.

4thly, Because it appears to us, that to restrain the subject in the disposition of his own property, without any other

pretence than the mere *possibility* of abuse, (this bill having been chiefly defended upon that ground) is a principle unheard-of in any free country, and most alarming to all the trading and monied interests of this kingdom; it goes to the subjecting, to the same restraint, on the same loose reasons, every great company, as well as every public or private stock, which may become of magnitude sufficient to tempt, in future times, an impoverished treasury, and a rapacious administration, since no degree of innocence can be a security against such suspicion of a *possible* fraud; and such a suspicion may be made a ground for continuing an arbitrary restraint, until the subject shall consent to ransom his property on such terms as shall be prescribed to him.

5thly, Because this annual restraint tends to establish a perpetual interposition of parliament, in declaring dividends for this company, and indeed all companies whatsoever, to the encrease of that most dangerous and infamous part of stock-jobbing,

bing, which is carried on by clandestine intelligence, and to the vesting it in the worst of all hands, those of administration; for a minister, who shall hereafter acquire in parliament (by whatever means) sufficient influence for the purpose, may, by his power of encreasing, diminishing, or withholding dividends at his pleasure, have all the stock-holders in these companies (a body extremely considerable for wealth and numbers) entirely at his mercy, and probably at his disposal, to the infinite encrease of the already overgrown, and almost irresistible influence of the Crown.

6thly, Because we apprehend, that this unprecedented practice of declaring dividends in parliament, may become a more alarming mode of undue influence on the members themselves, than any of those which have hitherto so frequently excited the jealousy of the legislature, since it furnishes a fund of corruption far greater than any hitherto known; a fund in its nature inexhaustible, of the greatest facility

cility in the application, and quite out of the reach of all discovery and prosecution. We think the principle of this bill the first step towards the introduction of such a new system of corruption, and have therefore resisted it, lest the constitution should become totally perverted from the ends for which it was originally established, and be no longer venerated by this nation, as giving security to liberty and property, and protection to the subject from all violence and injustice on the part of government.

Richmond,	Temple,
King,	Fred. Exon,
Portland,	Winchelsea and Notting-
Rockingham,	ham,
Monson,	Dartmouth,
Lyttelton,	Ponsonby.

Die

Die Jovis, 25^o Januarii, 1770.

A motion was made to take into consideration the present state of the nation.

A motion was made, and the question put, To adjourn.

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Dissentient',

1st, Because the noble Lord who moved the house on Monday last, that the Lords should be summoned for Wednesday, had declared in his speech, that he meant on that day to make a motion, which in its consequences would afford the opportunity of bringing under consideration of the House, many matters of the most essential concern to the happiness of this country; and we think that this House ought not, at any time, to refuse the request of a Peer, who desires that the House may be summoned upon a motion which he promises to make, and which he declares to be of importance.— And we are the better warranted in this opinion,

opinion, as we apprehend, that in fact, there are no instances of the House rejecting a motion for the Lords to be summoned.

2dly, Because, several Lords in administration being sensible of the indecency and novelty of directly rejecting such a motion, chose to get it rejected indirectly, by that parliamentary management of moving to adjourn to a long day; and we conceive such an artful conduct, unworthy of a House of Parliament at any conjuncture; but to be particularly so in the present moment, when his Majesty, in his speech, has recommended several matters of the most serious nature, to our immediate consideration, and when the universal discontent of the nation (on account of certain arbitrary and illegal proceedings, whereby their most valuable rights are subverted) threatens some near and dangerous crisis. In this moment, and when the House has not sat one day to do any other business than sending a complimentary address to the Crown,
when

when it had already adjourned for almost one week, to adjourn for another, will, we conceive, tend to damp the hopes of that relief, for which the people do, and ought in their present situation, to look up to this House: as it indicates an unwillingness to enter upon matters of the highest importance to the peace and welfare of the kingdom, affords a bad prognostic of the protection, which this House owes to the rights and liberties of the subject; and shews that we are more attentive to the conveniencies of Administration, than to the real grievances of the people.

3dly, Because, although no reason was alledged for this uncommon proceeding, one was hinted at, of an extraordinary nature indeed, whereby we are made to understand that this delay of a week, was necessary for administration to settle arrangements relative to an office, which was so closely connected with this House, that it could not fit without the officer. It is difficult for us to give our sentiments

C

upon

upon a matter, which the noble Lord who mentioned it, though called upon, refused to explain. But when we reflect that this hint came from a noble Lord in high and confidential office, we think it could have alluded only to the removal of the Lord High Chancellor of England, the Speaker of this House, and when we recollect the part so honourable to himself, but perhaps so offensive to administration, which that noble Lord had taken the first day of this session; we cannot but be apprehensive that there may be some evil counsellor, hardy enough to attempt punishments for freedom of debate in Parliament; and to dare advise his Majesty to remove from his office, a peer of this House, at the head of the law, for his vote in Parliament.

Richmond

Shelburne

Fortescue

Fitzwilliam

Manchester

Rockingham

Portland

Willoughby

Temple

Albemarle

Bolton

Die

Die Veneris, 2^o Februarii, 1770.

It was moved, in Committee, to resolve,
“ That the House of Commons in the
exercise of its judicature in matters of e-
lection, is bound to judge according to
the law of the land, and the known and
established law and custom of Parliament
which is part thereof.”

And the debate having lasted till half
an hour past eleven o'clock at night,

A motion was made, and the question
put, Whether the Speaker should resume
the chair.

It was carried in the affirmative.

A motion was made, and the question
put, Whether the original question shall
be now put,

It passed in the negative.

Contents 47*

Not Cont. 96

* *The following is a List of the Minority upon this division.*

Dukes.

Richmond
Manchester
* Devonshire
Northumberland
Bolton
Portland

Marquifs

Rockingham

Earls

Thanet
Aylesford
Suffolk and Berkshire
Huntingdon
Chatham
Coventry
Radnor
Scarborough
Stamford
Temple
* Dartmouth
Berkely
Effingham
Buckinghamshire
Albemarle
Fitz-William

* Abingdon

Tankerville
Viscount.

Torrington

Bishops.

John Bangor
Fred. Exon

Barons.

Lyttelton
Grosvenor
Abergavenny
Audley
Wycombe,
Camden
Chedworth
Craven
Archer
* Romney
Trevor
* Sondes
Boyle
King
Fortescue
Monson
Ponsonby
Milton
Hyde

Those mark'd thus * did not protest.

Dissentient',

Dissentient'.

1st, Because the resolution proposed was in our judgment highly necessary to lay the foundation of a proceeding which might tend to quiet the minds of the people, by doing them justice, at a time when the decision of the other House, which appears to Us inconsistent with the principles of the constitution, and irreconcilable to the law of the land, has spread so universal an alarm, and produced a general discontent throughout the kingdom.

2dly, Because, although we do not deny that the determination on the right to a seat in the House of Commons is competent to the jurisdiction of that House alone, yet, when to this it is added, that whatever they in the exercise of that jurisdiction think fit to declare to be law, is therefore to be considered as law, because there lies no appeal; We conceive ourselves called upon to give that proposition the strongest negative; for if
admitted,

admitted, the law of the land (by which all courts of judicature, without exception, are equally bound to proceed) is at once overturned, and resolved into the will and pleasure of a majority of one House of Parliament; who, in assuming it, assume a power to over-rule at pleasure the fundamental right of election, which the constitution has placed in other hands, those of their constituents: and if ever this pretended power should come to be exercised to the full extent of the principle, that House will be no longer a representative of the people, but a separate body altogether independent of them, self-existing and self-elected.

3dly, Because we are told that expulsion implies incapacity, and the proof insisted upon is, that the people have acquiesced in the principle by not re-electing persons who have been expelled; we equally deny the position as false, and reject the proof offered as in no way supporting the position to which it is applied. We are sure the doctrine is not to be found in
any

any statute or law book, nor in the journals of the House of Commons, neither is it consonant with any just or known analogy of law. And as not re-electing would at most but infer a supposition of the electors approbation of the grounds of the expulsion, and by no means their acquiescence in the conclusion of an implied incapacity, so were there not one instance of a re-election after expulsion but Mr. Woollaston's, that alone demonstrates that neither did the constituents admit, nor the House of Commons maintain incapacity to be the consequence of expulsion. Even the case of Mr. Walpole shews, by the first re-election, the sense of the people, that expulsion did not infer incapacity; and that precedent too, which is the only one of a declaration of incapacity, produced as it was, under the influence of party violence, in the latter days of queen Anne, in so far as it relates to the introduction of a candidate having a minority of votes, it decides expressly against the proceeding of the House

House of Commons in the late Middlesex election:

4thly, Because as the constitution hath been once already destroyed by the assumption and exercise of the very power which is now claimed, the day may come again when freedom of speech may be criminal in that House, and every Member who shall have virtue enough to withstand the usurpation of the time, and assert the rights of the people, will for that offence be expelled by a factious and corrupt majority; and by that expulsion rendered incapable of serving the public: in which case the electors will find themselves reduced to the miserable alternative of giving up altogether their right of election, or of chusing only such as are enemies of their country, and will be passive at least, if not active, in subverting the constitution.

5thly, Because, although it has been objected in the debate, that it is unusual and irregular in either House of Parliament to examine into the judicial proceedings

ceedings of the other, whose decisions, as they cannot be drawn into question by appeal, are, it is said, to be submitted to without examination of the principles of them elsewhere; we conceive the arguments go directly to establish the exploded doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, which, as applied to the acts of any branch of the supreme power, we hold to be equally dangerous; and though it is generally true, that neither House ought lightly and wantonly to interpose even an opinion upon matters which the constitution hath entrusted to the jurisdiction of the other, we conceive it to be no less true, that where under colour of a judicial proceeding, either House arrogates to itself the power of the whole legislature, and makes the law which it professes to declare; the other not only may but ought to assert its own right and those of the people; that this House has done so in former instances, particularly in the famous case of Ashby and White, in which the first resolution

D

of

of the Lords declares, "that neither House of Parliament hath any power by any vote or declaration to create to themselves any new privilege that is not warranted by the known laws and customs of Parliament!" We ought to interfere at this time, the rather as our silence on so important and alarming an occasion might be interpreted into an approbation of the measure, and be a means of losing that confidence with the people which is so essential to the public welfare, that this House, the hereditary guardians of their rights, should at all times endeavour to maintain.

6thly, Because, upon the whole, we deem the power, which the House of Commons have assumed to themselves, of creating an incapacity, unknown to the law, and thereby depriving, in effect, all the electors of Great Britain of their invaluable right of election, confirmed to them by so many solemn statutes, a flagrant usurpation, as highly repugnant to every essential principle of the constitution,

tion, as the claim of ship-money by King Charles I. or that of the suspending and dispensing power by King James II. This being, indeed, in our opinion, a suspending and dispensing power assumed and exercised by the House of Commons, against the ancient and fundamental liberties of the kingdom.

Temple	Portland
Audley	Thanet
Camden	Aylesford
Radnor	Berkley
Suffolk	John Bangor
Rockingham	Tankerville
Stamford	Fortescue
Torrington	King
Archer	Ponsonby
Wycombe	Monson
Chedworth	Huntingdon
Hyde	Buckinghamshire
Scarborough	Trevor
Boyle	Richmond
Northumberland	Lyttelton
Craven	Fitzwilliam

Coventry

Chatham

Fred. Exon

Albemarle

Effingham

Abergavenny

Bolton

Milton

Manchester

Grosvenor.

At twelve o'clock the same night the following motion was made, " That any
 " resolution of this House, *directly* or
 " *indirectly*, impeaching a judgment of
 " the House of Commons in a matter
 " where their jurisdiction is competent,
 " final, and conclusive, would be a vio-
 " lation of the constitutional right of the
 " Commons, tends to make a breach be-
 " tween the two Houses of Parliament,
 " and leads to a general confusion."

And the debate having lasted till two o'clock in the morning, the question was put,

It was resolved in the affirmative,

Dissentient,

1st, Because we apprehend that the rights and powers of the Peerage are not given

given for our own particular advantage, but merely as a constitutional trust, to be held and exercised for the benefit of the people, and for the preservation of their laws and liberties; and we should hold ourselves betrayers of that trust, unworthy of our high rank in the kingdom, and of our seats in this House, if we considered any one legal right of the subject, much less the first and most important of all their rights, as a matter indifferent and foreign to the Peers of this kingdom.

2dly, Because by this resolution it is declared to the world, that if the House of Commons should change the whole law of election, should transfer the rights of the freeholders to copyholders and leaseholders for years, or totally extinguish those rights by an arbitrary declaration; should alter the constitution of cities and boroughs with regard to their elections; should reverse not only all the franchises of suffrage which the people hold under the common law, but also trample upon the sanctions of so many
acts

acts of Parliament made for declaring and securing the rights of election; that even in such a critical emergency of the constitution, the people are to despair of any relief whatsoever from any mode, or direct or indirect interference of this House.

3dly, Because by this resolution the House not only refuses to stand by the people, in case they should suffer the most grievous injuries from their Representatives, but it abdicates its ancient and unquestioned province and duty of the hereditary Council to the Crown, rendering itself unable to give its advice in a point in which, of all others, the King may stand in the greatest need of the wisdom and authority of the Peers, a point such as the present, in which numbers of the constituents have, in a manner agreeable to law, carried up their complaints to the Throne against their Representatives.

4thly, Because by the said resolution we do a most material injury to the House of Commons itself; the resolution, by
the

the studied latitude of the words “directly or indirectly to impeach,” puts it out of the power of the Lords to offer, either in the present or in any future unfortunate difference between them and their constituents, even in the way of friendly conference, our amicable and healing mediation; the want of which may be a means of letting such difference run to extremities, fatal to the House of Commons itself, to the constitution, and, to the nation.

5thly, Because, we consider ourselves also, as an House of Parliament, to be most materially interested that the people should be legally and constitutionally represented; for as the House of Commons makes an essential part of Parliament, if that House should come to be chosen in a manner not agreeable to the laws and constitution of the kingdom, the authority of Parliament itself must suffer extremely, if not totally perish; the Peers can no more in their legislative capacity, do any valid act, without a “legal House
of

“ of Commons”, than without a “ legal
 “ Prince upon the Throne.”

6thly, Because, by this resolution, the constitutional controul has been given up, which this House, as appears by ancient and recent precedents have constantly claimed and exercised, and for the purpose of which, the legislature has been divided into separate branches; we are far from denying such a reciprocity of controul in the other House, even in matters within our separate and final jurisdiction, neither arrogating to ourselves, nor acknowledging in others any power distinct from or above the laws of the land: but we cannot behold without the utmost shame and indignation, this House making a voluntary surrender of its most undoubted legal, necessary, and sacred rights, not only omitting, but refusing to examine precedents; not previously desiring a conference with the other House, to discover whether they were inclined to admit in this House a correspondent immunity from interposition on their part,
 in

in matters within the particular jurisdiction of the Peers. These proceedings, are as derogatory from the dignity of the House, as they are contrary to its duty and its interests: They cannot fail of lowering this House, in the opinion of mankind, who will not believe that the Peers can have any attention to the welfare of the people, when they have shewn so little regard to their own honour. This resolution must tend to forward that plan, which with great uneasiness we have seen for a long time systematically carried on, for lowering all the constitutional powers of the kingdom, rendering the House of Commons odious, and the House of Peers contemptible.

7thly, Because, the impropriety of this resolution was infinitely aggravated, by the sudden and surreptitious method by which it was brought into, and carried through this House. That a resolution, new in matter, wide in extent, weighty in importance, involved in law and parliamentary precedents, should be moved

at midnight, after the House was spent with the fatigue of a former debate: that an adjournment of only two days, to enable the Lords to consult the Journals on this important point, should be refused, and that an immediate division should be pressed, are circumstances which strongly mark the opinion of the movers upon the merits of their own proposition: such a proceeding appears to us altogether unparliamentary and unjust; as it must, in every instance where it is practised, preclude all possibility of debate, and when by this means all argument and fair discussion is suppressed, the deliberations of the House will degenerate into silent votes.

We think ourselves, therefore, as Peers, and as Englishmen and freemen, (names as dear to us as any titles whatsoever) obliged to protest against a resolution utterly subversive of the authority and dignity of this House; equally injurious to the collective body of the people, to their representatives, and to the Crown, to which we owe our advice upon every public emergency

gency—a resolution, in law unconstitutional, in precedent not only unauthorised but contradicted; in tendency ruinous; in the time and manner of obtaining it unfair and surreptitious: and we here *solemnly declare and pledge ourselves* to the public, that we will persevere in availing ourselves, as far as in us lies, of every right, and every power, with which the constitution hath armed us, for the good of the whole, in order to obtain full relief for the injured Electors of Great-Britain, and full security for the future against this most dangerous usurpation upon the rights of the people, which, by sapping the fundamental principles of this government, threatens its total dissolution.

Temple
Audley
Camden
Radnor
Rockingham
Stamford

Torrington
Archer
Wycombe
Chedworth
Hyde
Scarborough

Boyle	Trevor
Northumberland	Richmond
Craven	Lyttelton
Portland	Fitzwilliam,
Thanet	Coventry
Aylesford	Fred. Exon
Berkeley	Effingham
John Bangor	Bolton
Tankerville	Manchester
Fortescue	Chatham
King	Albemarle
Ponsonby	Abergavenny
Monfon	Milton
Huntingdon	Grosvenor,

☞ *By a mistake of the Printer, the following Protest was omitted in its proper place. — It should have been inserted in page 10 of this Supplement; after the Protest against passing the East India Bill,*

Die Lunæ, 27° Februarii, 1769.

Dissentient',

1^o Because, upon the whole of the evidence it appears to us, that the Appellant has not proved himself to be the son of Lady Jane Douglas, and consequently not entitled to the character and heir of Tailzie and provision to Archibald Duke of Douglas.

Because

2° Because we are of opinion that it is proved, that the Appellant is not the son of Lady Jane Douglas.

Bedford	Dunmore
Bristol, C. P. S.	Milton.
Sandwich	

Die Martis, 1^o Maii, 1770.

THE order of the day being read for the Lords to be summoned,

The Earl of Chatham presented to the House a Bill, intituled,

A Bill for reversing the adjudications of the Commons, whereby John Wilkes, Esq; has been adjudged incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament; and the Freeholders of the County of Middlesex have been deprived of one of their legal representatives.

The said Bill was read the first time.

The following is an authentic copy of the Bill.

A Bill

A Bill for reversing the Adjudications of the House of Commons, whereby John Wilkes, Esq; has been adjudged incapable of being elected a Member to serve in this present Parliament, and the Freeholders of the County of Midsex have been deprived of one of their legal Representatives.

WHEREAS the capacity of being elected a Representative of the Commons in Parliament (is under known limitations of law) an original inherent right of the subject; and forasmuch as to deprive the subject of this high franchise and birth-right, otherwise than by a judgment according to the law of the land, and the constant established usage of Parliament conformable thereto, and part thereof, is directly contrary to the fundamental laws and freedom of this realm, and in particular to the act, “ declaring
“ the rights and liberties of the subject,
“ and settling the succession of the
“ crown,

“ crown, at the ever-memorable period
“ of the Revolution;” when free elec-
tion of Members of Parliament was ex-
pressly vindicated and secured.

And whereas John Wilkes, Esq; hav-
ing been duly elected and returned a
knight of the shire to serve in this present
Parliament for the county of Middlesex,
was, on the 17th of February 1769, with-
out being heard, adjudged incapable of be-
ing elected a Member to serve in this pre-
sent Parliament, by a Resolution of the
House of Commons, as follows:

“ Resolved,
“ That John Wilkes, Esq; having
“ been in this session of Parliament ex-
“ pelled this House, was and is incapable
“ of being elected a Member to serve in
“ this present Parliament.”

And whereas on the same day the said
House of Commons farther resolved as
follows: “ That the late election of a
“ knight of the shire to serve in this pre-
“ sent Parliament for the county of Mid-
“ dlesex is a void election:”

And

And whereas the said John Wilkes, Esq; having been again duly elected and returned a knight of the shire to serve in this present Parliament for the county of Middlesex, the said House of Commons did, on the 17th of March, 1769, resolve in the words following: “ That
 “ the election and return of John Wilkes,
 “ Esq; who hath been by this House
 “ adjudged incapable of being elected a
 “ member to serve in this present Parlia-
 „ ment, are null and void :”

And whereas the said John Wilkes, Esq; having been again duly elected and returned a knight of the shire to serve in the present Parliament for the county of Middlesex aforesaid, and having on the original poll-books, eleven hundred and forty-three votes in his favour against two hundred and ninety-six, in favour of Henry Lawes Luttrell, Esq; the House of Commons did, on the 15th of April, 1769, without hearing of parties, and in manifest violation of the indubitable right of the Freeholders of the county of Middle-
 sex

sex to chuse their representatives in Parliament, resolve as follows :

“ That Henry Lawes Luttrell, Esq;
 “ ought to have been returned a knight
 “ of the shire to serve in this present Par-
 “ liament for the county of Middlesex,
 “ and thereupon ordered the said return
 “ to be amended accordingly ;”

And whereas, by another resolution of the 8th of May, 1769, the said House of Commons did, upon hearing the matter of the Petition of the Freeholders of the county of Middlesex, as far as the same related to the election of Henry Lawes Luttrell, Esq; farther resolve as follows :

“ That Henry Lawes Luttrell, Esq; is
 “ duly elected a knight of the shire to
 “ serve in this present Parliament for the
 “ county of Middlesex.”

And forasmuch as all the resolutions aforesaid, cutting off the subject from his indubitable birth-right, by a vote of one House of Parliament, exercising discretionary power and legislative authority, under colour of a jurisdiction in elections,

are most arbitrary, illegal, and dangerous

Be it therefore declared and enacted, by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, "That all the adjudications contained in the above-mentioned several resolutions are arbitrary and illegal, and the same are and shall be hereby reversed, annulled, and made void, to all intents and purposes whatsoever."

After the first reading of the Bill, it was moved,

That the said Bill be read the second time, on Thursday next;

After a long debate, the question was put,

It was resolved in the negative,

Contents 43

Not Cont. 89

Then it was moved that the said Bill be rejected.

And the question was put thereupon.

It was resolved in the affirmative.

Dissentient,

Dissentient',

Because the foundations of this Bill being so fully laid, in the reasons contained in two Protests entered upon the Journals of this House on the second day of February last, we think it indispensibly necessary to protest against the rejection of the same, to the intent that it may be delivered down to posterity, that this great constitutional and effectual method of remedying an unexampled grievance, hath not been left unattempted by us; and that to our own times, we may stand as men determined to persevere in renewing, on every occasion, our utmost endeavours to obtain that redress, for the violated rights of the subject, and for the injured electors of Great-Britain, which, in the present moment, an over-ruling fatality hath prevented from taking effect; thereby refusing reparation and comfort to an oppressed and afflicted people.

Chatham

40 PROTESTS. A. 1776.

Chatham	John Bangor
Portland,	Wycombe
Plymouth	Fortescue
Rockingham	Huntingdon
Abingdon	Tankerville
Boyle	Abergavenny
Grosvenor	King
Stanhope	Ferrers
Penlonby	Lyttelton
Suffolk	Bolton
Richmond	Camden
Radnor	Coventry
Archer	Buckinghamshire
Fitzwilliam	Scarborough
Temple	Northumberland
Torrington	Manchester.
Rutland	

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

F I N I S.

